### REPORT OF THE AUDIT OF THE FORMER CARROLL COUNTY SHERIFF

For The Year Ended December 31, 2006



# CRIT LUALLEN AUDITOR OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

www.auditor.ky.gov

105 SEA HERO ROAD, SUITE 2 FRANKFORT, KY 40601-5404 TELEPHONE (502) 573-0050 FACSIMILE (502) 573-0067

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### AUDIT EXAMINATION OF THE FORMER CARROLL COUNTY SHERIFF

### For The Year Ended December 31, 2006

The Auditor of Public Accounts has completed the former Carroll County Sheriff's audit for the year ended December 31, 2006. Based upon the audit work performed, the financial statement presents fairly, in all material respects, the revenues, expenditures, and excess fees in conformity with the regulatory basis of accounting.

#### **Financial Condition:**

Excess fees increased by \$13,726 from the prior year, resulting in excess fees of \$16,308 as of December 31, 2006. Revenues increased by \$27,594 from the prior year and expenditures increased by \$14,583.

#### **Report Comment:**

• The Former Sheriff's Office Lacked Adequate Segregation Of Duties.

#### **Deposits:**

The former Sheriff's deposits were insured and collateralized by bank securities or bonds.

<u>CONTENTS</u> PAGE

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT	1
STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND EXCESS FEES - REGULATORY BASIS	3
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENT	6
REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF THE FINANCIAL	
STATEMENT PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS	11
COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATION	15



The Honorable Harold Tomlinson, Carroll County Judge/Executive The Honorable Charles Maiden, Jr., Former Carroll County Sheriff The Honorable Ben Smith, Carroll County Sheriff Members of the Carroll County Fiscal Court

#### **Independent Auditor's Report**

We have audited the accompanying statement of revenues, expenditures, and excess fees regulatory basis of the former Sheriff of Carroll County, Kentucky, for the year ended December 31, 2006. This financial statement is the responsibility of the former Sheriff. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on this financial statement based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Audit Guide for County Fee Officials issued by the Auditor of Public Accounts, Commonwealth of Kentucky. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statement is free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statement. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

As described in Note 1, the Sheriff's office prepares the financial statement on a regulatory basis of accounting that demonstrates compliance with the laws of Kentucky, which is a comprehensive basis of accounting other than accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

In our opinion, the financial statement referred to above presents fairly, in all material respects, the revenues, expenditures, and excess fees of the former Sheriff for the year ended December 31, 2006, in conformity with the regulatory basis of accounting described in Note 1.

In accordance with <u>Government Auditing Standards</u>, we have also issued our report dated April 5, 2007 on our consideration of the former Sheriff's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with <u>Government Auditing Standards</u> and should be considered in assessing the results of our audit.



The Honorable Harold Tomlinson, Carroll County Judge/Executive The Honorable Charles Maiden, Jr., Former Carroll County Sheriff The Honorable Ben Smith, Carroll County Sheriff Members of the Carroll County Fiscal Court

Based on the results of our audit, we have presented the accompanying comment and recommendation, included herein, which discusses the following report comment:

• The Former Sheriff's Office Lacked Adequate Segregation Of Duties.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Sheriff and Fiscal Court of Carroll County, Kentucky, and the Commonwealth of Kentucky and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these interested parties.

Respectfully submitted,

Crit Luallen

**Auditor of Public Accounts** 

April 5, 2007

## CARROLL COUNTY CHARLES MAIDEN, JR., FORMER SHERIFF STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND EXCESS FEES - REGULATORY BASIS

#### For The Year Ended December 31, 2006

#### Revenues

State Grants			\$ 45,843
State - Kentucky Law Enforcement Foundation Program Fund	d		11,284
State Fees For Services: Finance and Administration Cabinet Transporting Prisoners	\$	25,578 8,329	33,907
Circuit Court Clerk: Sheriff Security Service Arrest Fees Collected		33,582 2,940	36,522
County Clerk - Delinquent Taxes			1,153
Commission On Taxes Collected			205,798
Fees Collected For Services: Auto Inspections Accident and Police Reports Serving Papers Carrying Concealed Deadly Weapon Permits		7,090 320 21,595 2,809	31,814
Other: Add-on Fees Miscellaneous		16,050 15,389	31,439
Interest Earned			1,592
Borrowed Money: State Advancement			 120,000
Total Revenues			519,352

#### CARROLL COUNTY

#### CHARLES MAIDEN, JR., FORMER SHERIFF

STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND EXCESS FEES - REGULATORY BASIS For The Year Ended December 31, 2006 (Continued)

#### **Expenditures**

Operating Expenditures and Capital Outlay:		
Personnel Services-		
Deputies' Salaries	\$ 78,699	
Part-Time Salaries	36,979	
Other Salaries	25,242	
Overtime	15,862	
KLEPF Pay	9,300	
Employee Benefits-		
Match KLEPF	1,299	
Employer Paid Health Insurance	 32,979	\$ 200,360
Contracted Services-		
Copier Lease	1,383	
Nextel Phone	3,596	
Internet	450	
Materials and Supplies-		
Office Materials and Supplies	1,701	
Uniforms	3,463	
Auto Expense-		
Gasoline	21,547	
Maintenance and Repairs	7,443	
Other Charges-	ŕ	
Conventions and Travel	1,488	
Dues	463	
Postage	2,932	
Grant	45,843	
Bond	908	
CCDW	1,895	
Transporting Prisoners	6,198	
Fees assessed for Service for County	6,520	
Pictures Developed	989	
Miscellaneous	3,222	110,041
		,
Debt Service:		
State Advancement		 120,000
Total Expenditures		430,401
Total Experientics		 730,701

#### CARROLL COUNTY

#### CHARLES MAIDEN, JR., FORMER SHERIFF

STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND EXCESS FEES - REGULATORY BASIS For The Year Ended December 31, 2006 (Continued)

Net Revenues	\$ 88,951
Less: Statutory Maximum	 69,341
	10.610
Excess Fees	19,610
Less: Training Incentive Benefit	 3,302
Excess Fees Due County for 2006	16,308
Payment to Fiscal Court -February 27, 2007	 16,308
Balance Due Fiscal Court at Completion of Audit	\$ 0

## CARROLL COUNTY NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENT

December 31, 2006

#### Note 1. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

#### A. Fund Accounting

A fee official uses a fund to report on the results of operations. A fund is a separate accounting entity with a self-balancing set of accounts. Fund accounting is designed to demonstrate legal compliance and to aid financial management by segregating transactions related to certain government functions or activities.

A fee official uses a fund for fees to account for activities for which the government desires periodic determination of the excess of revenues over expenditures to facilitate management control, accountability, and compliance with laws.

#### B. Basis of Accounting

KRS 64.820 directs the fiscal court to collect any amount, including excess fees, due from the Sheriff as determined by the audit. KRS 134.310 requires the Sheriff to settle excess fees with the fiscal court at the time he files his final settlement with the fiscal court.

The financial statement has been prepared on a regulatory basis of accounting, which demonstrates compliance with the laws of Kentucky and is a comprehensive basis of accounting other than accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Under this regulatory basis of accounting revenues and expenditures are generally recognized when cash is received or disbursed with the exception of accrual of the following items (not all-inclusive) at December 31 that may be included in the excess fees calculation:

- Interest receivable
- Collection on accounts due from others for 2006 services
- Reimbursements for 2006 activities
- Tax commissions due from December tax collections
- Payments due other governmental entities for payroll
- Payments due vendors for goods or services provided in 2006

The measurement focus of a fee official is upon excess fees. Remittance of excess fees is due to the County Treasurer in the subsequent year.

#### C. Cash and Investments

At the direction of the fiscal court, KRS 66.480 authorizes the Sheriff's office to invest in the following, including but not limited to, obligations of the United States and of its agencies and instrumentalities, obligations and contracts for future delivery or purchase of obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the United States, obligations of any corporation of the United States government, bonds or certificates of indebtedness of this state, and certificates of deposit issued by or other interest-bearing accounts of any bank or savings and loan institution which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) or which are collateralized, to the extent uninsured, by any obligation permitted by KRS 41.240(4).

CARROLL COUNTY NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENT December 31, 2006 (Continued)

#### Note 2. Employee Retirement System

The county officials and employees have elected to participate in the County Employees Retirement System (CERS), pursuant to KRS 78.530 administered by the Board of Trustees of the Kentucky Retirement Systems. This is a cost-sharing, multiple-employer, defined benefit pension plan that covers all eligible full-time employees and provides for retirement, disability, and death benefits to plan members.

Benefit contributions and provisions are established by statute. Nonhazardous covered employees are required to contribute 5.0 percent of their salary to the plan. The county's contribution rate for nonhazardous employees was 10.98 percent for the first six months and 13.19 percent for the last six months of the year. Hazardous covered employees are required to contribute 8 percent of their salary to the plan. The county's contribution rate for hazardous employees was 25.01 percent for the first six months and 28.21 percent for the last six months of the year.

Benefits fully vest on reaching five years of service for nonhazardous employees. Aspects of benefits for nonhazardous employees include retirement after 27 years of service or age 65. Aspects of benefits for hazardous employees include retirement after 20 years of service or age 55.

Historical trend information pertaining to CERS' progress in accumulating sufficient assets to pay benefits when due is presented in the Kentucky Retirement Systems' annual financial report which is a matter of public record. This report may be obtained by writing the Kentucky Retirement Systems, 1260 Louisville Road, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601-6124, or by telephone at (502) 564-4646.

#### Note 3. Deposits

The former Sheriff maintained deposits of public funds with depository institutions insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) as required by KRS 66.480(1)(d). According to KRS 41.240(4), the depository institution should pledge or provide sufficient collateral which, together with FDIC insurance, equals or exceeds the amount of public funds on deposit at all times. In order to be valid against the FDIC in the event of failure or insolvency of the depository institution, this pledge or provision of collateral should be evidenced by an agreement between the Sheriff and the depository institution, signed by both parties, that is (a) in writing, (b) approved by the board of directors of the depository institution or its loan committee, which approval must be reflected in the minutes of the board or committee, and (c) an official record of the depository institution.

#### Custodial Credit Risk - Deposits

Custodial credit risk is the risk that in the event of a depository institution failure, the Sheriff's deposits may not be returned. The former Sheriff did not have a deposit policy for custodial credit risk but rather followed the requirements of KRS 41.240(4). As of December 31, 2006, all deposits were covered by FDIC insurance or a properly executed collateral security agreement.

CARROLL COUNTY NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENT December 31, 2006 (Continued)

#### Note 4. K-9 Drug Account

The former Sheriff had an account used for the care and upkeep of a drug dog. The account was also used to make drug buys and for criminal investigative efforts focusing on the abuse and diversion of prescription drugs. The account had a beginning balance of \$8,198. The account had revenues totaling \$5,809 and expenditures totaling \$5,064. The remaining account balance of \$8,943 was turned over to the fiscal court at the end of December 2006.

#### Note 5. Lease

The office of the former Sheriff was committed to a lease agreement with DeLage Landen for a copy machine. The agreement required a monthly payment of \$82 for 48 months. This agreement was paid in full as of July 1, 2006.

REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS



The Honorable Harold Tomlinson, Carroll County Judge/Executive The Honorable Charles Maiden, Jr., Former Carroll County Sheriff The Honorable Ben Smith, Carroll County Sheriff Members of the Carroll County Fiscal Court

> Report On Internal Control Over Financial Reporting And On Compliance And Other Matters Based On An Audit Of The Financial Statement Performed In Accordance With Government Auditing Standards

We have audited the statement of revenues, expenditures, and excess fees - regulatory basis of the former Carroll County Sheriff for the year ended December 31, 2006, and have issued our report thereon dated April 5, 2007. The former Sheriff's financial statement is prepared in accordance with a basis of accounting other than generally accepted accounting principles. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in <u>Government Auditing Standards</u> issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

#### **Internal Control Over Financial Reporting**

In planning and performing our audit, we considered the former Carroll County Sheriff's internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the former Carroll County Sheriff's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the former Carroll County Sheriff's internal control over financial reporting.

Our consideration of internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the preceding paragraph and would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. However as discussed below, we identified a certain deficiency in internal control over financial reporting that we consider to be a significant deficiency.

A control deficiency exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect misstatements on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a control deficiency, or combination of control deficiencies, that adversely affects the entity's ability to initiate, authorize, record, process, or report financial data reliably in accordance with the regulatory basis of accounting such that there is more than a remote likelihood that a misstatement of the entity's financial statement that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control over financial reporting.



Report On Internal Control Over Financial Reporting And On Compliance And Other Matters Based On An Audit Of The Financial Statement Performed In Accordance With Government Auditing Standards (Continued)

We consider the deficiency described in the accompanying comment and recommendation to be a significant deficiency in internal control over financial reporting.

• The Former Sheriff's Office Lacked Adequate Segregation Of Duties

A material weakness is a significant deficiency, or combination of significant deficiencies, that results in more than a remote likelihood that a material misstatement of the financial statement will not be prevented or detected by the entity's internal control. Our consideration of the internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in the internal control that might be significant deficiencies and, accordingly, would not necessarily disclose all significant deficiencies that are also considered to be material weaknesses. However, we consider the significant deficiency described above to be a material weakness.

#### **Compliance And Other Matters**

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the former Carroll County Sheriff's financial statement for the year ended December 31, 2006, is free of material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit and, accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of management, the Carroll County Fiscal Court, and the Kentucky Governor's Office for Local Development and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Respectfully submitted,

Crit Luallen

Auditor of Public Accounts

April 5, 2007



## CARROLL COUNTY CHARLES MAIDEN, JR., FORMER SHERIFF COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATION

For The Year Ended December 31, 2006

#### INTERNAL CONTROL – SIGNIFICANT DEFICIENCY AND MATERIAL WEAKNESS:

#### The Former Sheriff's Office Lacked Adequate Segregation Of Duties

During our review of the internal control, we found that the office had a lack of segregation of duties. Due to the entity's diversity of official operations, small size and budget restrictions, the official has limited options for establishing an adequate segregation of duties. The former Sheriff should have properly segregated the duties of his office or implemented the following compensating controls to offset this internal control weakness:

- The former Sheriff should have periodically compared a bank deposit to the daily checkout sheet and then compared the daily checkout sheet to the receipts ledger.
- The former Sheriff should have periodically compared the bank reconciliation to the balance in the checkbook.
- The former Sheriff should have compared the quarterly financial report to the receipts and disbursements ledger for accuracy.
- The former Sheriff should have periodically compared invoices to payments.

These reviews should have been indicated with the Sheriff's initials.

Former Sheriff's Response: None

#### PRIOR YEAR:

<u>The Sheriff's Office Lacks Adequate Segregation of Duties</u> - This has not been corrected and is repeated in the current year audit report